

(Mark xvi. 16) till he has been baptized, till he has been washed by the waters of the mystical Jordan, for his covenanted purification from the moral leprosy of sin. But suppose an unbaptized person, professing repentance and faith, should neglect or refuse baptism, from careless unconcern toward the sacrament, or from a false persuasion, as in the case of the Quaker, would there be no difference between the two—between him who had and him who had not received baptism? God is graciously pleased not to tie himself to his own ordinances, and therefore, while it is said, “He that believeth not shall be damned,” it is not said, “He that is not baptized shall be damned,” the gracious and merciful Lord judging how far the unbaptized is to be or not to be excused. But there is no *positive promise of Gospel blessings without baptism*. The Church, therefore, does not hold that the supposed truly penitent and believing adult is regenerate till he is baptized, and that when baptized he is regenerate. In the case of the infant there can, of course, be no effectual working of the Spirit, no moral change supposed or produced; but the gift of the Spirit is presumed, according to the Calvinistic view, that the child is one of the elect. To one who believes in universal redemption, that the gift of the Spirit is, through the sacrifice of Christ, imparted to every one,\* to work afterwards effectually or not, according to the Spirit being not resisted, while at baptism, through the mercy of his Saviour, the blessed child receives all that can be imparted to him, he is made

---

\* Page 9 of Dr. P.'s pamphlet.